# The New-York Times.

VOL. VII.....NO. 2066. NEW-YORK, TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1858. PRICE TWO CENTS.


Custom-House, and appears determined to hang out as long as she can, or until her side gains.

San Luis Potosi is now the theatre of the most outrages, robberies and destructions of property. If we can credit in the least the official reports, the forces of Governor DEGOLLADO are sacking the haciendas as bad as San Luis as the pirates are in the south of Puebla. WIZEMAN, with a considerable force, is marching on San Luis to oppose the movements of DEGOLLADO. At present the State is mostly in the hands of the Constitutionalists.

Tamaulipas is almost entirely in the hands of the Constitutionalists. Tampico, inside the walls, is all the Government holds. Governor GARZA has been for several weeks besieging the city. As yet we hear of his gaining no particular success. GARZA has lately been committing some queer acts. He has published a decree, declaring free for denouncement (preemption) all uncultivated lands in the State of Tamaulipas. This is unquestionably intended as an inducement for personally disposed persons in the United States to migrate to Tamaulipas, and grow rich upon the fat lands of that prolific State. He has also taken it into his head to collect double dues from vessels leaving the port, he having possession and control of the bar. A French and a Spanish vessel-of-war have left Vera Cruz to go to Tampico to protest against this. For my own part, I think their movement is only to assist the Government in gaining the day there. The conduct of the French and Spanish officials in this country is most contemptible, from the clear interest manifested in trying to put down the Constitutionalists.

As to the State of Nuevo Leon and Coahuila, it is VIDAURRI, and VIDAURRI, I believe, is working for the Sierra Madre Republic. This mad and futile scheme I fear will find too many supporters in the United States. It must fail, for foreign powers cannot recognize a new Republic without looking into the accounts of the old concern and foreseeing the way in which they are to be paid. An investigation, I think, must tend to an adjustment of the whole nation according to the ideas you have so boldly enunciated. The TIMES must have the credit of first proposing the only remedy that must ultimately be applied to Mexico—an American Protectorate.

I have now given your readers a glance at the condition of things in the Departments, and now must conclude with a brief sketch of things in this capital. What interests the American reader most is to learn how the affairs of his own nation are getting along here. I regret it is not in my power to speak favorably of American influence or American diplomacy here. I may be too fast in speaking disparagingly of American influence, but I only allude to it so far as the interests of the American nation are officially represented here. Within the past fortnight a disastrous break-down has occurred to some negotiations the resident American Minister here was attempting with the government. An attempt was made to make a treaty for more territory at the North, according to some instructions given by Mr. CASS in July or August last. The government at first thought the instructions were new, from the fact, I suppose, that a gentleman from the *Herald* office arrived here and was reported to have brought "important dispatches." There was for a few days a lively laying-together of heads, but the Government smelt the old cheese and declined to nibble any further. Thus has the present Minister of the United States to Mexico another relic to lay upon the tomb of his five treaties. I believe he is now making an attempt to get hold of the forelock of Time, by electioneering with a popular aspirant for the Presidency, with the view of making a treaty with him when he gets in power. Mr. FORSYTH seems determined to make a treaty of some sort. If he fails, it will not be for want of desire on his part. In case the United States are disposed to continue him here much longer, they certainly should try to assist him to make some kind of a treaty, even if it didn't amount to much.

Thus stands our relations with Mexico. The relations of other Governments do not amount to much. There is nothing in them to interest the readers of the TIMES. The Government itself is again hard up. The clergy do not pay up well, and the troops have now been for days without pay. A new loan of a million or more is talked of. The clergy of course will have to come to the scratch.

With regard to the future of Mexico, I think the TIMES has dealt a fair and deliberate blow at our evils, and has suggested the only course—a protectorate—that can be adopted. Sooner or later the United States must do the job, and the sooner the better, for every day the case is becoming more aggravated. I commend you to continue. You will soon have a large party here to think with you. The only thing the United States now wants here is a clever diplomat—a man who can make friends with and manage these people. With such a man the Mexican nation could soon be prepared to take the road to its salvation.

## DESTINY OF MEXICO.

### Interesting and Important Letter from Gen. Worth, on the Necessity of an American Protectorate of Mexico.

*From the Richmond South.*

SANTA FE, N. M., Wednesday, March 31, 1858.

The following letter, written by the late General W. J. WORTH, and addressed to the lamented W. L. MARCY, then Secretary of War under Mr. POLK's Administration, contains sentiments which are fast claiming the attention of the American people, and which must eventually be reduced to verified history. It was the effect of a three days' Cabinet consultation, but the policy indicated was finally rejected by Mr. POLK, that statesman being contented to *consummate*, during his Administration, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and the purchase and acquisition of California and New-Mexico. The letter was inclosed to me, in response to an editorial article on "Manifest Destiny," which appeared in the *Santa Fé Gazette*. The gentleman from whom it was received was an intimate friend and relation of General WORTH, and hence its genuineness cannot be doubted.

Take it as a whole, it is interesting, and shows that its author was a far-seeing statesman, fully comprehending the final destiny of the Republic of Mexico. We begin to see already the error committed in not adopting the policy foreshadowed in the paper. Statesmen are now agitating the very proposition, in another form, here submitted. The late movement of Senator HOUSTON, of Texas, in the United States Senate, is but the repetition of this policy, proposed from another stand-point and under different circumstances. But it is not my object to enlarge upon the subject. The letter itself is lengthy, but none the less readable because lengthy. Mexico is doomed as an independent nation. In spite of blood and bayonets, she must become territory of the United States. The hand-writing is upon the wall; and her fate can no more be avoided than could the trembling Babylonian King avert the fiat sent forth against him. S. M. Y.

LETTER FROM GEN. WORTH.

CITY OF MEXICO, Saturday, Oct. 30, 1847.

MY DEAR SIR: It is now, I think, some two years since I have written to you upon other than official subjects, and for reasons which, if donit not, you have fully comprehended and appreciated.

The official reports have advised you of the brilliant exploits of this army; but what is to be done next? I take it for granted that no reasonable man, who has been six months in the country, and has during that time given the slightest attention to Mexican policy, and the study of Mexican character, supposes for a moment that there is the slightest prospect for peace. The Mexican people, the most vain-glorious of nations, down to the period of the breaking out of this war, can scarcely yet realize, notwithstanding their numerous defeats, that they are inferior to us, as we know them to be, morally and physically. If is true they have been mortified and humbled by the results of their various contests with us, but not yet satisfied. Like their Spanish ancestors, they are endowed with a tenacity and obstinacy of purpose which it requires a series of years of misfortune to overcome. It is only within a few years—some four or six—that Spain acknowledged the independence of this country, after a contest of thirty years! Independently of these considerations, there is no party in the country that *dares* make a peace, even were it so inclined. We have seen this illustrated in the recent negotiations with SANTA ANNA, unquestionably the ablest and, to the period of the recent expulsion from this city, the strongest man in Mexico.

If any one knew the inability of Mexico to contend with us it was he; and I think it cannot be doubted, taking into consideration all the circumstances of his position, that he plainly saw the necessity of peace, both as a means of saving the nationality of his country and maintaining himself in power; and yet such was the infatuation of his countrymen, some of them actuated by what they believed to be patriotism, others by views of self-interest, that he did not dare to stem the torrent and act as his better judgment and the instinct of self-preservation dictated. There has been no change of opinion or action since, nor is there likely to be any. The new government, if it may be so called, at Queretaro, meets with but indifferent support from the people and the States, because of its supposed inclination to peace, and the Congress, notwithstanding every effort has been made, still fails to meet. I think, then, we may regard such a peace as our national honor demands as out of the question. But what is to be the alternative? Shall we retrograde and occupy the line we have proposed, or shall we overrun and hold the whole country? By adopting the first, we shall, in a measure, abandon the war and bring ourselves into more or less contempt with the nations of Europe. I say abandon the war, because it is well known that the object of crossing the Rio Grande, and especially of the campaign from Vera Cruz to this Capital, the geographical centre and heart of the Republic, was to compel, or, in the exact phrase of the day, to "conquer a peace." This peace will not be attained by withdrawing to a line, however generously that line may be arranged, and consequently the object for which the war was undertaken will have failed! But it does not become a great nation like ours to fail in aught it undertakes; and hence I regard our honor as implicated in the prosecution of the war until either the object of it is attained or the whole country subdued. Considerations of policy and of interest greatly strengthen these views. That our race is finally destined to overrun the whole continent is too obvious to need proof. Like an axiom in mathematics, it is only necessary to state the proposition to insure belief; and we may state it thus: put two distinct races in juxtaposition, one powerful and superior in civilization, and it will absorb the weaker and inferior. The most that can be said in opposition to this is, that we are somewhat premature—perhaps half a century—but what is half a century in the affairs of a nation like ours, thoroughly imbued with the progressive spirit? A mere point, which, like a point in mathematics should not enter into a solution of the great problem. It being, then, a part of our destiny to overrun this country—a destiny which we can no more avoid, despite all the struggles of short-sighted politicians, than we can change the order of nature—the question is, whether we shall complete the work we have already so nearly accomplished, or leave it to be undertaken *de novo* by our children!

Having spent most of the blood and treasure which the conquest requires, shall we relinquish it, and thus impose the same sacrifice upon another generation? But it is contended, by a large and respectable party at home, that further extension endangers the stability of our confederation; to which it may be answered, that this doctrine has been the favorite theme since the adoption of the Constitution. If we refer to the *Federalist*, and other records of former days, we shall find that many honest politicians entertained serious apprehensions of the tenacity of the Old Thirteen. Since then we have had two-thirds of a century of experience as to the workings of our institutions, and this experience has entirely dispelled all apprehensions on that subject. The United States now occupy two-thirds more territory than when, in the days of the adoption of the Constitution, the St. Marys, in Georgia, formed our Southern boundary; and, so far from this extension having weakened the Government, has produced dissent and discontent among the States, it has had the contrary effect, as every one who has noticed the progress of events must have observed. Under the Old Thirteen there was more party violence and more interruption of order than has been witnessed since, and it is reasonable, under our form of government, that it should be so, as in popular Governments, when the community is small, every question agitates it throughout. Each one of the parts is, in the proportion to the smallness of the whole, more important, and hence the bitterness of the struggle. A Presidential election—that great rock upon which many have predicted we should split—does not create, in our day, a tittle of the excitement it did formerly, because, there being so many States to vote, each feels that its vote is comparatively of less importance. The States only know the Federal Government through its benefits, and each being, so far as the great mass of human affairs is concerned, a separate and independent community, it matters not whether its position be near or remote from the centre. It is this great feature which so eminently distinguishes our own from a central Government that those who oppose a further extension seem to have lost sight of. All their reasoning proceeds from a supposed analogy, which does not in fact exist, between our system and those of other Governments—the Roman for instance—central in their composition, which are believed to have fallen from too great extension. I believe it was the sentiment of Mr. MADISON that our capability of extension was limited, only by the facilities of communicating between the centre and the circumference. Canals railroads and magnetic telegraphs overcome those difficulties. But I forbear to enlarge upon topics more familiar to your mind than my own, and have only touched those to expose the process of reasoning by which, after much reflection, I have arrived at the conclusion that it is our decided policy to *hold the whole of Mexico*. The details of occupation are comparatively unimportant. I mean by occupation, *permanent conquest* and *future annexation*. Harmonize the occupation with our system of government. Lay off the country into Territories, organize Territorial Governments, appoint civil Governors, and go through all the other ceremonies which we have practiced with regard to the formation of Territories, and their subsequent admission into the Union as States. Each of these might be constituted into a military district and assigned—subject to civil rule—to competent military officers to aid the territorial government in the execution of the laws and the preservation of order. Forty thousand men would be sufficient for this purpose, to be supported by the country occupied, and it can be demonstrated—applying our admirable system of accountability and administration in financial affairs—that so far from imposing burdens, it would lighten those under which these people now groan, fifty per cent. Under their system, or the want of it, notoriously seventy-five of every hundred dollars, received through the customs, and other innumerable sources of taxation, goes into the pockets of the vagrant military, or other equally vagrant employes. In the next generation the military might be withdrawn. The advantages flowing to the Mexican people, as well as to ourselves, from this ultimate incorporation, in everything which concerns security of person, property, and the prosperity of commerce, are too obvious to invite comment.

With many apologies for this intrusion, I remain, very truly yours, W. J. WORTH.

To the Hon. WM. L. MARCY, &c., &c., &c., Washington, D. C.

## THE KANSAS BILL.

### Opinions of Ex-Governors Walker and Stanton.

WASHINGTON CITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Friday, April 30, 1858.

*To the Editor of the Union:*

I ask you to publish the enclosed letter of Governor WALKER in justification of my vote and that of my colleague, Mr. LAWRENCE, to-day, in favor of the Conference bill. The letter explains itself. It is a manly vindication of our much-abused judgment. I understand that it meets with Gov. STANTON's approval. I hope so. It seems so consonant with his views and experience. It certainly had its full weight in determining my vote on so vexed a question. With respect, SAMUEL S. COX.

WASHINGTON CITY, Tuesday, April 27, 1858.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of this date has just been received, and I hasten to say that, in my judgment, the conference Kansas bill should be adopted. I expressed this opinion on first reading the bill on Saturday last, and must adhere to it, although, if the bill had been, as falsely represented, a submission of the ordinance only, I should have sternly opposed it. This bill, *as interpreted by me*, is in precise conformity with my views of course, not only in Kansas, but since my return; and, in following the path where duty and conscience bade me, I must support it. I must be permitted, however, to do this in such a way as will cast no censure on valued friends, who honestly oppose this bill, because their construction of it differs from my own. Whilst this bill maintained my views as to popular sovereignty, it would, if adopted, save the Union from infinite peril. If the bill passes, the odious Lecompton Constitution, born in fraud, and baptized in forgery and perjury, will be defeated by an overwhelming vote of the people of Kansas, thus demonstrating by practical results the truth of my interpretation, that this bill does in fact submit the Constitution to the popular suffrage for ratification or rejection, which is all I have ever required. With such a bill, and such a decision of that people, under it, no formidable effort will ever be again made to withhold from the people of Indiana, Illinois or any other State the power to form and regulate their own domestic institutions, and the oligarchive doctrine of *conventional* sovereignty will be abandoned. I write in great haste, and will, at a future period, embody my views fully in a letter for publication, as expressed in our recent conversation.

Yours, truly, R. J. WALKER.

Hon. S. S. COX and the Hon. WM. LAWRENCE.

MR. STANTON'S SENTIMENTS.

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1858.

*To the Editors of the National Intelligencer:*

GENTLEMEN: In this morning's *Union* the Hon. SAMUEL S. COX, in his letter accompanying that of Gov. WALKER on the subject of the Kansas conference bill, states that he understands the latter document to meet my approval. I beg the use of a small space in your columns for a brief explanation.

I have not seen Gov. WALKER's letter until after Mr. COX had had stated its contents in the House of Representatives on the 30th ult. Not having heard even of the existence of the paper, I could not have given any opinion upon it, although I was well aware of Gov. WALKER's views, and of his frank expression of them from his first reading of the bill, which took place in my presence.

The difference between Gov. WALKER and myself is not very material; yet justice to my own strong convictions seems to require me to make them known. I agree that *the bill in question does virtually submit the Lecompton Constitution to a vote of the people of Kansas*, however ungraciously this act of justice may be conceded. But the condition of this submission are, in my judgment, in the highest degree illiberal and unfair, creating an unjust discrimination in favor of a Constitution already rejected by the people, and attempting to coerce them into acceptance by a sort of constraint which is unworthy of Congress, and necessarily offensive to the people of the Territory. Notwithstanding these objections, however, when it was proposed that the Anti-Lecompton Democrats should support the measure, I was ready, in deference to the judgment of Governor WALKER and others, to waive my own opposition and to acquiesce in its passage, although I would have hesitated to vote for it if the responsibility of such a vote had rested upon me. My confidence in the stern purpose of the people of Kansas to vindicate their rights, even under all the disadvantages of this bill, rendered the modification of the Crittenden Montgomery proposition less material, especially as I believe *there will be sufficient population in the Territory during the present year for the* formation of a State Constitution. Moreover, I am well satisfied that when a new Congress shall be elected, fairly representing the people, and having due respect for their rights, the just claims of the State of Kansas will be liberally acknowledged, and her rejection of the land grants, offered in connection with a fraudulent and hateful Constitution, will not be permitted to prejudice her interests as an equal member of the Confederacy, entitled to all the advantages which have been usually conferred upon new States, at the time of entering the Union.

Although I cannot agree with Governor WALKER in saying the measure "is in precise conformity with my views," I do concur in his opinion that the result of this proceeding, when acted upon by the people of Kansas and adjudged by the people of the Union, will tend to the firm establishment of the great doctrine of popular sovereignty, and will also rebuke and overwhelm those who have so long and pertinaciously struggled to deprive the people of the Territory of the right to adopt or reject their own Constitution.

But I feel confident that Gov. WALKER, in stating that the measure in question was in precise conformity with his views, intended only to approve what he regarded as the main feature of the bill: the submission of the Constitution to the vote of the people. And although he did not regard the objectionable details as justifying his opposition to the measure, he would certainly condemn and repudiate them under any other circumstances than those attending the passage of this bill.

In my judgment the difference of opinion among the Anti-Lecompton Democrats as to the details of this measure ought not to separate those who have heretofore denounced and still oppose the Lecompton Constitution. FRED. P. STANTON.

## LATEST BY TELEGRAPH.

### FROM WASHINGTON.

**The Case of an American Seaman Imprisoned by the Portuguese Authorities at Benguela—A Camel Battalion to be Organized—The Capitol Extension—Bounty Land for Privateersmen, &c.**

Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.

WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

Intelligence has been received from the United States ship *Dale*, of the African Squadron, to the 11th of February. She was then at St. Paul de Loando, about starting for Monrovia. The *Dale* had called at the port of Benguela, and found an American seaman, JEREMIAH SULLIVAN, from the whaler *Cassia Third*, of New-Bedford, who had been imprisoned ten months by the Portuguese authorities for merely being in company with a sailor who had committed an assault. The Commander of the *Dale* made a fierce demand upon the Government, and threatened to bombard the fort and town if the American was not granted a trial. His release was then effected, and the *Dale* took the two men on board and brought them off.

Hon. HUMPHREY MARSHALL intends to introduce a resolution for the organization of a camel battalion, on the principle of the camel batteries employed in the East. If authorized, an effort will be made to have the men armed with the formidable new gun invented by Mr. G. LEE, of Cincinnati.

The Washington Art Association are making an effort to have Congress take away the control of the Capitol extension from Capt. MEIGS, and place it under a Committee of Congress and a commission of artists.

Mr. DAVIS, of Massachusetts, will shortly report a bill from the Naval Committee, giving one hundred and sixty acres of bounty land to the privateersmen in the war of 1812.

The evening train brought on a drove of Western office-seekers.

The Cabinet, at its meeting to-morrow, will decide what volunteer regiments will be accepted, and whether they shall be mounted.

Symptoms appear of a strong fight over the Yrisarri Treaty. O.

[FROM THE REPORTER FOR THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.]

WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

Senator BIGGS was to-day confirmed by the Senate as Judge of the United States District Court for North Carolina, in place of HENRY POTTER, recently deceased, who occupied the station 56 years, and who was appointed by THOMAS JEFFERSON.

The nomination of Judge LORING, of Massachusetts, to supply the vacancy in the Court of Claims, occasioned by the death of Judge GILCHRIST, was communicated to the Senate by the President to-day. Many of the Democratic Senators united in the request for his appointment. R. H. HALLETT was also, to-day, nominated for Solicitor of the Court of Claims, in place of MONTGOMERY BLAIR, removed.

These two nominations have not yet been acted upon.

The object of Mr. GROW in asking leave to-day to introduce a joint resolution in the House to prevent the sale of the public lands, under a proclamation of the President, until ten years after survey, was to prevent speculators from absorbing them, leaving the preemption laws as they now exist.

The Democratic Senators will hold a caucus to-morrow morning in relation to the course to be pursued to facilitate the public business.

The Cass-Yrissarri Treaty has been communicated to the Senate, but no action has as yet been taken thereon.

The bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY to-day, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices, proposes to establish a line of mail steamers between the ports of New-York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Liverpool, touching at Norfolk and Savannah. The Postmaster-General is authorized to contract with ANDREW W. THOMPSON to establish the line, which is to consist of six iron steamers of not less than 3,000 tons each. The Secretary of the Treasury is to advance bonds of the United States, bearing five per cent. coupons payable semi-annually, and the principal in twenty years, to the amount of two-thirds the cost. The building of the ships is to be paid for from time to time, as the work progresses, and this amount is to be returned to the Treasury in annual payments of ten per cent., commencing at the end of the second year and continuing till the whole is paid. The compensation is to be $25,000 each for a complete voyage out and back. The amount advanced is to be secured by a mortgage lien on the steamers. The contract is to be for ten years regular service, which is to commence a year from the date of the contract.

It is said the President had prepared a Message on the affairs of Utah, which would have been sent to Congress had the Deficiency Bill been defeated, as on its passage depended the support of the expedition to that Territory.

The report of a forthcoming Message from the President on Cuban affairs is revived, but it can be traced to no authentic source.

## XXXVth CONGRESS.....First Session.

SENATE.....WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

The morning hour was occupied in a discussion on a motion by Mr. CHANDLER, of Michigan, to appropriate $50,000 to finish the channel of St. Clair Flats. The debate assumed somewhat of a party color, the Republicans wishing to make it a test vote on the question of internal improvements.

Finally a substitute that the Committee on Commerce be instructed to report as to the expediency of making appropriations sufficient to preserve from decay the River and Harbor works already commenced, was agreed to, 32 against 23, Mr. CHANDLER giving notice that he would to-morrow introduce a bill asking a special appropriation of $55,000 to complete the works at St. Clair Flats.

The Indian Appropriation bill was then taken up. Mr. TOUCEY, of Illinois, objected to some of the items, but the bill finally passed without amendment, by 26 against 9. The dissentients were Messrs. Broderick, Durkee, Foot, Foster, King, Harlan, Pugh, Trumbull and Wade. The bill appropriates over a million and a quarter of dollars. Adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

On motion of Mr. GARTRELL, of Georgia, a resolution was adopted that the daily hour of meeting of the House, on and after Wednesday next, will be 11 o'clock, instead of 12.

Mr. SMITHSON, of Georgia, gave notice that to-morrow at 1 o'clock he will move to take up the Senate bill for the admission of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS, Wednesday and Thursday of next week were set apart for the consideration of Territorial business.

Mr. GROW (Pa.) asked leave to introduce a joint resolution prohibiting the public lands from exposure at public sale, under a proclamation of the President, until the same have been surveyed, and the returns filed in the land office for ten years.

Mr. CRAWFORD (Va.) objected.

Mr. GROW moved a suspension of the rules. Rejected, 74 against 70.

Mr. LETCHER, of Virginia, asked leave to offer a resolution that during the day time the debate in Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union shall be confined to the bill under consideration, and that evening sessions may be held when the majority of the Committee desire them for general debate only.

Objection was made, and the House refused to suspend the rules to allow the introduction of the resolution—91 against 57, not two-thirds voting in the affirmative.

On motion of Mr. J. GLANCY JONES, the House went into Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, and resumed the consideration of the Bill making appropriations for the Legislative, Executive and Judicial expenses of the Government.

A Message from the President of the United States was received, accompanied by four immense bundles of manuscripts, which were piled up in the centre aisle.

Mr. JONES, of Tenn., facetiously observed that from their bulk they involve the safety and perpetuity of the country. (Laughter.) Much anxiety was expressed to know their contents, and the Committee rose.

The Message was read, by which it appeared that the documents contained a copy of the correspondence relative to Indian affairs in Washington, Oregon and California.

Mr. MORGAN, of N. Y., said that five clerks were employed nine months in copying it.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, remarked that the War Department had yet to reply to the resolution which called forth this monster document from the Interior Department.

The House, after various suggestions, laid the documents on the table, and refused by a large vote to print them.

The consideration of the legislative, executive and judicial appropriation bill was resumed, but the proceedings were very dull, with but a thin attendance of members.

Without action the House adjourned.

**Admission of Minnesota—Is the Legislature Perpetual?—Provisions of its Constitution Relative to Elections, Amendments, &c.—The Fort Snelling Affair.**

*Correspondence of the New-York Times:*

WASHINGTON, Sunday, May 2, 1858.

For six months the inchoate State of Minnesota, with a population five or six times as great as that of Kansas, and with a Constitution framed under an enabling act of Congress, and unanimously accepted by her people, has been compelled to stand at the door of the Union awaiting the result of a contest which had no possible connection with her own claims, and which had no interest for her, more than for any member of the confederacy. Meantime her representatives have been kept here in inaction; idleness, and all the needed legislation for a new State has been postponed, to the sacrifice of both public and private interests. At last, within a few weeks of the end of the session, there appears a probability that her case will be taken up, considered, and acted upon. If well enough, Mr. STEPHENS will probably move to-morrow to take up the Minnesota bill (which has already been published;) it is at any rate intended that the subject shall be brought up this week. This being the case, it will be interesting to glance at a few points in connection with the application of Minnesota for admission into the Union.

I do not find that there is to be any concerted opposition to the admission of Minnesota; on the contrary, the prevailing impression seems to be that she should be at once invested with the full privileges of a State; but scattering signs of opposition do exist, based upon four distinct points, to wit:

1. Irregularities in the formation of the Constitution.
2. Frauds in the election of State officers.
3. Defects in the Constitution itself, alleged to make members of the Legislature members for life.
4. Liberality of the Constitutional provisions relative to suffrage.

The first point cannot be much insisted on, since the Constitution was adopted by both Conventions, and almost unanimously ratified by the people. If any irregularities existed, they were more effectually cured by this action than they would be by any action of Congress. The second point, I understand, will be raised by Mr. WASHBURNE, of Illinois, and others, but neither ought that to militate against the admission of the State, let the allegations relating thereto be either true or false. Frauds in the election under the Constitution have nothing to do with the validity of that instrument, and are solely matters of State concern. If frauds are proved in the election of Congressmen, they relate to the admission of gentlemen claiming to be members, and considerations subsequent to the admission of the State.

The third point has been somewhat magnified, and will repay a moment's attention. It is said that there is no provision in the Constitution for the election of a new Legislature, and that, contrary to the spirit of Republicanism, the present Legislature is perpetual. The articles of the Constitution relating to this subject are as follows:

SEC. 23. The Legislature shall provide by law for an enumeration of the inhabitants of this State in the year 1865, and every tenth year thereafter. At their first session after each enumeration as made, and also at their first session after each enumeration made by the authority of the United States, the Legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of Congressional, Senatorial and Representative districts, and to apportion anew the Senators and Representatives among the several districts, according to the provisions of section second of this article.

SEC. 24. The Senators shall also be chosen by single districts of convenient contiguous territory, at the same time that the members of the House of Representatives are required to be chosen, and in the same manner, and no Representative district shall be divided in the formation of a Senate district. The Senate districts shall be numbered in regular series, and the Senators chosen by the districts designated by odd numbers shall go out of office at the expiration of the first year, and the Senators chosen by the districts designated by even numbers shall go out of office at the expiration of the second year; and thereafter the Senators shall be chosen for the term of two years, except there shall be an entire new election of all the Senators at the election next succeeding each new apportionment provided for in this article.

Now, although at first glance there does appear to exist some ground for the allegation, an examination of the subject will show that a judicial construction of these sections destroys it. The members of the Senate are divided into two classes, all, after the first Legislature, holding two years, but half being elected annually. By section 24, above quoted, Senators are to be chosen "at the same time members of the House of Representatives are required to be chosen." This shows that it was the intention of the instrument that representatives should be chosen annually, and indicates a clerical omission of the article to that effect, and, in fact, there was such an omission, in copying the Constitution, of the following article:

"Members of the House of Representatives shall be elected to serve for one year, and members of the Senate shall be elected to serve for two years." See official proceedings of Convention.

The intention being thus clearly ascertained, any lawyer will tell you that the Courts would decide that the Representatives cannot hold for more than one year, and that an election must take place annually. But aside from this certain fact, by the articles above quoted a new election must take place for Senators and Representatives every five years—that is after each census by the State and by the United States. In either case the Legislature is not perpetual, and there is nothing anti-republican in the term of office existing even for the longest time mentioned. It is positively certain, however, that if there should be any attempt on the part of Representatives to insist on the longest term, an appeal to the Courts would settle the fact that they could only hold for one year. Under these circumstances it is deemed beyond the authority of Congress to delay the admission of the State until the people have amended a clerical error which would be promptly corrected by the Courts in the improbable event of a dispute. The impolicy of such a delay, considering the injustice and injury to the interests of Minnesota which it would work, is still less questionable, when the Legislature can within forty days itself correct the error. The following section will show the ease with which the amendment could be effected:

SEC. 1. Whenever a majority of both houses of the Legislature shall deem it necessary to alter or amend this Constitution, they may propose such alterations or amendments, which proposed amendments shall be published with the laws which have been passed at the same session, and said amendments shall be submitted to the people for their approval or rejection; and if it shall appear in a manner to be provided by law that a majority of the voters present, and voting, shall have ratified such alterations or amendments, the same shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as a part of this Constitution. If two or more alterations or amendments shall be submitted at the same time, it shall be so regulated that the voters shall vote for or against each separately.

Would Congress be justified, therefore, when the people of Minnesota have such an easy, simple and inexpensive plan of amendment, to resort to the harsh measure of keeping them another year out of the Union, and entailing upon them the large expense of another Constitutional Convention? Every fair person must admit that it would be a rank piece of injustice. The delays of Congress have already cost the pioneer people of Minnesota $100,000, besides innumerable annoyances.

The part of the Constitution relating to the elective franchise provides that every male person of the age of twenty-one years, who shall have resided in the United States one year, in the State four months, &c., and who is either: 1. A white citizen of the United States. 2. White person of foreign birth, who has declared on oath his intention to become a citizen of the United States, one year previous to his offering to vote, and who shall have taken out his papers for naturalization at least ten days prior to the election; 3. Civilized persons of Indian blood, who have adopted the habits of civilization; and 4. Persons of mixed white and Indian blood, who have adopted the habits of civilization; and who have severally resided within the limits of the State, more than one year, and who have exercised and possessed the rights of citizens by voting at an election, or serving as a juror, or holding office, or enjoying the right of citizenship by a treaty, are entitled to vote at all elections held in the State, and are entitled to vote for all officers elective by the people.

These provisions are certainly extremely liberal, and there may be objections to them; but whatever they may be, I conceive that Congress has nothing to do with them. A State, in the exercise of its sovereign power, may regulate its elective franchise for itself, and no other power has a right to interfere. The people of New-York would be quite apt to deny the right of Congress to come in and make objections to the provision of your laws permitting persons possessed of a certain freehold, to vote, whenever might be their individual opinion as to the propriety of allowing negroes to exercise that privilege; but Congress has the same right to do that in New-York as to do the same thing in Minnesota. Congress having already declared, therefore, that under specified conditions, Minnesota "shall come in" to the Union, the obligation to admit her appears to be imperative. I hope it will be done at once, and with a good grace.

The Union, this morning, publishes in full the minority report of Messrs. FAULKNER and JOHNSON on the Fort Snelling sale. It contains one or two points on which I did not touch in my previous letter on the subject. To the point, for instance, of the Secretary's reason for making the sale by private contract, the report quotes the evidence of general advertising to show that if it had been public, there would have been combinations of persons to buy the property at the minimum price of a dollar and a quarter an acre, and to prevent the Government from getting more than that price. Hon. GEO. L. BECKER testified as follows on this point:

"Answer—You are aware that we have a system in the West, which is a part of the unwritten law of the land, by which claim associations are formed by parties for the purpose of protecting each other at these public sales. It is very rare that Government land ever brings more than a dollar and a quarter per acre at public sale.

Question 1,622—Does not that system apply mainly to those claiming preemption rights?

Answer—No, Sir.

Question 1,623—Is it considered honorable among the men in your country to carry out such a system where there are no preemption rights?

Answer—It is. We do not look upon the Government as a land speculator. Such associations were formed at the time a portion of this reserve was sold three or four years ago. Claims were made upon it, and the parties went on to make improvements. An Association was formed by the parties interested. They appeared at the land office on the day of sale. The sale was conducted quietly and without disturbance, but the land was all purchased at a dollar and a quarter per acre.

Question 1,624—Were you ever engaged in such a combination?

Answer—I bid off a part of that land."

The method of these combinations is stated to be, to prevent, by fear of violence, any outsider from bidding, and to carry away by force any one who attempts to do so. HENRY M. RICE, FRANCIS J. ROBERT, Ex-Secretary of the Territory, Ex-Governor MEDARY, W. J. CULLEN, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, and others, testified to a similar effect. In this view of the case, the Government have done better in selling to Mr. SCHELL than they would have done if the sale had been public. It does not appear that the Commissioners of sale knew any other party but Mr. SCHELL in effecting the sale, and Mr. SCHELL was preferred because he had made extensive improvements upon the property. I am inclined to think, from an examination of the report, that a correct view of the whole affair lies in a medium between the two reports. As to the authority to sell, and the value of the reservation to the United States, the weight of reason seems to be with the majority; but against the so-called "New-York Company," at least in the part played by RICHARD SCHELL, there does not appear to be anything worse proved, or reasonably suspected, than a decidedly small business transaction. I therefore suggest a substitute for the resolutions of the majority, defining more stringently the authority of the Secretary of War, requiring future sales to be public, no matter what prices the property brings in consequence, and letting the matter drop there. We shall then have no more scandal of the sort involved in this affair. O.

### United States Supreme Court.

WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

No. 70.—Francis Warner *vs.* Captain H. Morley *et al.*—Justice MCLEAN delivered the opinion of the Court, affirming the judgment of the United States Court for the Northern District of Illinois, with costs and interest.

Nos. 95, 96, 98, 99, 100 and 112.—All continued till the next term of the Court.

No. 103.—David Moreland *vs.* Jeremiah Page.—Argued on both sides.

No. 97.—Joseph Barton *vs.* Robert Forsyth.—Argument commenced for plaintiff.

### Disasters by Fire.

THE VICTIMS AT THE BOSTON FEDERAL-STREET FIRE.

BOSTON, Monday, May 3.

It has been ascertained that CUTTING and TUFTS, both firemen, were the only two persons killed outright at the Federal-street fire on Sunday morning. They will be buried this afternoon from the Harvard-street Baptist Church, and the entire fire department is expected to attend the obsequies. Mr. RHARDS and Mrs. MORAN are at the hospital, and may possibly recover. The loss insurred by the fire will, it is thought, reach $250,000, the greater part of which is insured in Boston.

DESTRUCTIVE FIRE IN MONTREAL—FOUR LIVES LOST.

MONTREAL, Saturday, May 1.

The Converse Rope Factory was destroyed by fire this afternoon. The foreman and three girls were burnt to death. One man jumped from the fourth story, and broke his back. Loss not ascertained, but it is very heavy, and said to be uninsured.

### Injunction to Prevent the Designation of a New State Paper.

ALBANY, Monday, May 3.

An injunction was issued this morning, at the suit of THURLOW WEED & Co., proprietors of the *Evening Journal*, prohibiting GEORGE J. TOUREE, Secretary of State, SAMUEL R. CARMAN, Comptroller, and ISAAC VANDERPOOL, State Treasurer, from designating a new State paper instead of the *Journal*. The injunction having been issued by a single Judge, and without the notice required by the law of 1841, has been discharged by the State officers, who have executed a contract with the *Atlas and Argus*.

### Burning of the Ship Majestic.

HALIFAX, Monday, May 3.

The steamship *Osprey*, from St. John, N. F., arrived here on Saturday night. On the 26th ult. she fell in with the ship *Majestic*, twenty-one days from Liverpool, for Charlestown, on fire, and took off twenty of her passengers and crew. Before the boats parted from the *Majestic*, the flames burst through her deck.

### The National Typographical Union.

CHICAGO, Monday, May 3.

The National Typographical Union convened here to-day. E. C. EVANS, of Philadelphia, was elected President for the coming year, and it was voted that the next meeting be held in Boston.

### The Steamship Delta at Boston.

BOSTON, Monday, May 3.

The Cunard steamship *Delta*, from Halifax, is coming up the harbor. She comes here for repairs.

### The Cholera at Charleston.

CHARLESTON, Monday, May 3.

The United States mail steamship Columbia, Capt. BAKER, from New-York arrived here this afternoon at 1 o'clock.

### The Southern Mails.

WASHINGTON, Monday, May 3.

The mails from all points South as late as due are to hand, but bring no news of importance.

### The Charleston-Fort Fight—Correction.

To the Editor of the New-York Times:

In your edition of this morning, in the report of the firemen's fight in Charleston street, yesterday afternoon, Columbian Engine Company No. 14 is mentioned as participating in it; the facts are these: No. 14 Engine, at the time of the disturbance, was house at the engine-house, and no person connected with the company was near the scene of the riot, or had any connection with it. Respectfully,

ROBERT ROGERS,
Foreman Engine Company No. 14.

### A Card from W. Flye Maurice.

BOSTON, Monday, May 3, 1858.

To the Editor of the New-York Times:

A statement appeared in the Courier of yesterday dated May 1—that I refused my endorsement for $10,000, which is, in one sense, true, inasmuch as I declined to endorse my own name, but I did endorse the name of C. A. Terrassin, No. 60 Commercial-street, for $10,000.

By publishing the above, you will much oblige,

Yours, respectfully,

WILLIAM FLYE MAURICE.

The New-York Times, Friday, May 4, 1866.

THE
NEWEST HAT,
Elegant, combining all colors upon the skeleton of the
A DERBY HAT
Is worn by all the leading actors, singers and sporting men.
It is the lightest and handsomest hat in the market.
Also, the Celebrated Knox Hats, Derbys and Fedoras.
KNOX,
No. 212 Canal-st., and No. 81 Nassau-st.,
Also, 214 Fulton-st., Brooklyn.
Also, 1491 Broadway, corner Forty-second-st.
Also, 1 Astor House, Broadway, and 1 Fifth-ave. Hotel.
NEW YORK.
Also, 204 Regent-st., London, and 14 Rue de la Paix, Paris.
Also, 10 Rue Castiglione, Paris.
Also, 214 Kearny-st., San Francisco.
Also, 10 Kearny-st., San Francisco.
Also, 212 Montgomery-st., San Francisco.
Also, 10 Montgomery-st., San Francisco.
Also, 10 Montgomery-st., San Francisco.
Also, 10

The New-York Times, Friday, May 4, 1860.

The New-York Herald Monday, May 4, 1868.

The New-York Times Index, Classified Page 6 Table

# The New-York Times.

## COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS.

Monday, May 2—P. M.

The Official Averages of the Banks of the City of New-York, for the past week, ending Saturday, May 1, the particulars of which are advertised on each Bank operating in another page of this paper, present in the aggregate the following results, when the previous weekly statement of Saturday last is taken for comparison:

| | May 1, 1858. | April 24, 1858. | Increase. | Decrease. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Loans and Discounts | $58,000,000 | $57,000,000 | $1,000,000 | |
| Specie | 9,000,000 | 8,900,000 | 100,000 | |
| Circulation | 3,000,000 | 3,100,000 | | 100,000 |
| Deposits | 45,000,000 | 44,000,000 | 1,000,000 | |

The Bank Statement, besides showing the remarkable specie figure of $38,064,314, exhibits an average of Undrawn Deposits rising nearly millions, the estimated maximum for May 1. The probable average of Deposits on the last day of May will be $46,000,000, or $2,000,000 more than the present average. The Loans will probably reach $60,000,000, or $2,000,000 more than the present average. The Circulation will be about $3,000,000, or $100,000 less than the present average. The Specie will probably be $40,000,000, or $2,000,000 more than the present average. The Legal Reserve will be $15,000,000, or $500,000 more than the present average. The Surplus will be $5,000,000, or $1,500,000 more than the present average.

Under foreclosure.—Mr. A. M. Mitchell sold the two-story brick house and lot south side of 126th-st, 75 feet east of 3d-av, to Mr. Thomas Cooper, for $3,000.

Mr. Geo. A. Conover has commenced excavating for a three-story brick house on the north side of 31st-st, 75 feet west of 6th-av.

Mr. Charles H. Haines has taken a lease of the two-story brick house on the south side of 125th-st, 75 feet east of 3d-av, for a term of years, at $300 per annum.

Mr. Wm. Hoyt has taken a lease of the three-story brick house on the north side of 27th-st, 75 feet west of 6th-av, for a term of years, at $400